REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

<u>Claim Amendments</u>

The claims have been amended to implement the amendments intended by applicants' "Response and Amendment Under 37 CFR 1.111" filed on 16 April, 2007, those amendments having not been entered per the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment dated 19 January, 2007 by reason of the scanning or facsimile errors or deficiencies described below under the heading "Examiner's Interview Summary Report".

The present independent claims (viz. claims 17 and 22) now require that: i) the <u>association of the documents with the concept identifiers presented on the electronic display be updated on the basis of the learned dynamic information pertaining to the user</u>; and, ii) those associated documents are all documents input over a period time which have been "<u>stored up to date in storage means</u>". No new matter has been added by these amendments.

For the convenient reference of the Examiner, the following is a reproduction of new claim 17 in which the limitations added to this claim (over previous claim 1) are shown by underlining:

An electronic document viewer system for personalized presentation to a user of a plurality of electronic documents input from a source <u>over time and stored in storage means</u>, said system comprising:

(a)   a knowledge base comprising a plurality of concepts, themes, sub-concepts and/or sub-themes;

(b)   a user preferences knowledge base comprising preferences information personal to said user;

(c)   a concept recognizer component configured for using said knowledge base and/or said user preferences knowledge base for recognizing one or more said concepts, themes, sub-concepts and/or sub-themes associated with content of said documents <u>stored up to date in said storage means</u>;

(d)   a concept learner component configured for automatically learning dynamic information pertaining to said user on the basis of prior action(s) of said user automatically sensed by an environment sensor, for input to said knowledge base;

(e)   a prioritization analyser component configured for dynamic ordering of said recognized concepts, themes, sub-concept and/or sub-themes, with said documents associated therewith, according to priorities of said user determined from said preferences information, wherein said preferences information includes said learned dynamic information; and,

(f)   a viewer component configured for: (i) presenting on an electronic display a first hierarchical level of multiple levels of prioritized concept identifiers interlinked according to a hierarchical structure based on said ordering, wherein each said concept identifier represents said documents associated therewith and one said recognized concept, theme, sub-concept and/or sub-theme; and, (ii) presenting on said electronic display, in turn, one or more next lower hierarchical levels of said hierarchical structure of prioritized concept identifiers upon selection thereof by said user from one said concept identifier presented on said electronic display;

wherein said association of said documents with said concept identifiers presented on said electronic display by said viewer component is updated on the basis of said dynamic information pertaining to said user that is learned by said concept learner.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the claim rejections by the Examiner having regard to the following submissions.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejection

The Examiner rejected all of the previous claims, except previous dependent claims 6 and 13, on the basis of alleged anticipation by the cited reference Millier (U.S. patent No. 5,899,995). Withdraw of this rejection is respectfully requested in view of the present claim amendments and the following submissions.

As indicated above, the independent claims have been amended to recite that there is an association of up-to-date input documents with concept identifiers for presentation on the electronic display by the viewer component, and that such association is updated on the basis of the learned dynamic information pertaining to the user. The cited reference Millier does not in any manner disclose such a dynamic document viewer presentation by which the association (i.e. classification) of documents with concept identifiers (for presentation), being all documents input to the system up-to-date, and not just future input documents per Millier, is updated on the basis of changing, automatically learned user preferences. In Millier, there is no suggestion that the data in folders will be re-organized based on new knowledge that been learned.

In the case of Millier, learned information affects only how the filing of documents into folders will take place thereafter, i.e. on a going forward basis, but does not alter or affect the filing of previously filed documents which will remain in the originally designated folders regardless of any user action or preferences subsequently learned. In Millier's system, no re-categorization of a document is possible or contemplated and no suggestion is made that the data in folders will be re-organized based on new knowledge that has been learned. As stated previously, Millier has no concern with, or any discussion whatsoever regarding, the presentation of prioritized concept identifiers. Instead, Millier is directed to a method and means for automatically filing information, for all time, into a number of pre-profiled categories (folders) – see Fig. 2A.

By contrast, Applicant's system and method provide for a dynamic personalized presentation of documents as those documents are input over time and user preferences change over time. Concept recognition operates on a store of documents, input to date, in combination with concept learning that dynamically learns of changing user preferences and environment and associates those documents with those learned concepts on an on-going basis. As stated under, inter alia, paragraph 70 of the present application, as published (corresponding to lines 22-27 of page 21 of the application as filed): "The background functions executed by the concept learner

component 130, and the concept recognizer 140 and prioritization relevance analyser 150, continue to learn new knowledge (e.g. reinforcement of concepts and/or user activity) and they may operate to update the current browser view displayed for the user as new information about concepts is accumulated (that is, if relevant to the current concept view screen being shown to the user)."

It is noted, in the Examiner's response to the previously filed arguments, that a statement is made which is believed to incorrect and unwarranted in view of the claims and subject matter of this application. Specifically, the Examiner alleges that Applicant relies on "prioritization" not recited in the rejected claims. In fact, the feature of prioritization *is*, in effect, recited and claimed because the claims require dynamic ordering of recognized concepts etc. according to user preferences information-based priorities. It is submitted that this "ordering" is the same as, and in effect *is*, a prioritization.

The cited Millier reference does not teach every aspect of the amended claims and, accordingly, Applicant requests withdrawal of this objection and allowance of these claims.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection
The Examiner also rejected previous dependent claims 6 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Millier and further in view of Hyatt (U.S. patent No. 6,678,692). In view of the foregoing and the present claim amendments, Applicant traverses such allegation and requests that the same be withdrawn.

Like Millier, and for the same reasons provide above, the cited reference to Hyatt does not disclose the features of the amended independent claims. Nor does it teach those features or in any manner suggest them if viewed in combination with Millier. Since each of the remaining amended claims is dependent upon claim 17 or 22, and since it is submitted that the independent claims they refer to define new and inventive subject matter over both of Millier and Hyatt, it follows that each of said

dependent claims is also new and inventive. Applicant submits, therefore, that these claims are also in form for allowance.

Examiner's Interview Summary Report

The substance of the interview was the undersigned's notification to the Examiner that the Office Action dated 2 November, 2007 failed to address the claim amendments made by applicants' "Response and Amendment Under 37 CFR 1.111" filed on 16 April, 2007 and, that applicants' "Response to Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment Mailed 19 July, 2007" filed on 14 August, 2007, a copy of which is enclosed herewith, had not been properly processed and acted upon by your Office, causing the Examiner to review claims which were old, rather than the intended amended claims filed on 16 April, 2007.

More specifically, your Office failed to act upon our "Response to Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment Mailed 19 July, 2007", filed on 14 August, 2007, whereby we advised of certain scanning or facsimile errors occurring in your Office in respect of the "Response After Final with RCE", filed 23 August, 2006, which appear to be the cause for your Office's rejection of the amendments filed 16 April, 2007 as being allegedly non-compliant. Instead of reviewing and acting upon that "Response to Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment Mailed 19 July, 2007", it is apparent from a review of the public PAIR system that your Office posted only the enclosure to that Response, being a copy of the earlier "Response After Final with RCE" filed on 23 August, 2006. As a result, it is noted that the public Pair system shows the same 23 August, 2006 amendment posted under two dates, one being posted as 23 August, 2006 when it was filed and another as 14 August, 2007. Instead, the 14 August, 2007 posting on PAIR should be the applicants' "Response to Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment Mailed 19 July, 2007".

The Examiner suggested to applicants that, to try to redress these Office errors, they could file a Request to withdraw finality or file an RCE. The latter is being pursued by applicants, at expense to applicants, as it is believed to be the surest way to correct the Office error without further complication occurring. ·

Page 11 of 12

CONCLUSIONS

For all the foregoing reasons, applicants respectfully submit that the amended claims submitted herewith are in good form for allowance and the same is requested. In the event that the Examiner cannot allow the present application for any reason, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' attorney to discuss resolution of any remaining issue.

Respectfully Submitted,
Abu-Hakima, Suhayya, Dr. et al.

By: _____
Lynn S. Cassan
Registration No. 32,378
Attorney for applicants
Phone: 613-238-6404 x 232

Date: 7 January, 2008

Page 12 of 12

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: ABU-HAKIMA, Suhayya, Dr. et al.

Serial No: 09/902,026

Filed: 10 July, 2001

Examiner: Sara M. Hanne

Supervisory Examiner: Weilun Lo

Group Art Unit: 2179

Title: CONCEPT-BASED MESSAGE/DOCUMENT VIEWER
                      FOR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS AND INTERNET
                      SEARCHING

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE TO:
"NOTICE OF NON-COMPLIANT AMENDMENT" MAILED 19 JULY, 2007

Dear Sir:

Applicant hereby responds to the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment mailed 19 July, 2007, signed by the Supervisory Examiner Weilun Lo.

By said Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment, your Office objected to the response/amendment filed on 16 April, 2007 as being allegedly non-compliant because claim 1 listed in the amendment/response filed on 23 August, 2006 is alleged to be inconsistent with the claim listed in the amendment/response filed on 16 April, 2007. As we have been unable to identify any such inconsistencies from our file copies of those responses/amendments, we reviewed the Image File Wrapper copy of the amendment/response filed on 23 August, 2006, as posted on the USPTO web portal, in an attempt to identify such alleged inconsistencies. From this review, it has become apparent to us that the Office's fax copy of applicant's amendment/response filed on 23 August, 2006 is missing some of the "strike-out" lines of claim 1 in the Listing of Claims, apparently due to failings in the fax transmission and/or printing of

Page 1 of 3

the transmitted document at your Office's receiving fax terminal. To show the errors we have identified on that copy shown on the web-portal, based on a comparison of same with our true copy of the amendment/response as fax filed on 23 August, 2006, we are enclosing a true and exact copy of the complete paper, "RESPONSE AFTER FINAL WITH RCE", filed on 23 August, 2006, with Listing of Claims starting on page 2 thereof, on which the undersigned has highlighted, by hand, by means of thicker over-lining, all of the amendments shown by claim 1 of said Listing of Claims filed on 23 August, 2006.

As will be seen from the enclosed highlighted copy of the amendment/response filed on 23 August, 2006, contrary to the Examiner's allegation in the Notice of Non-Compliance that the "claims as amended [on 23 August, 2006] name step (b) twice, once in line 6 and then again on line 12", the alleged second named step (b), at line 12 of claim 1, **is struck out** in claim 1 filed on 23 August, 2006.

As will also be seen from the enclosed highlighted copy of applicant's response/amendment filed on 23 August, 2006, contrary to the Examiner's allegation in the Notice of Non-Compliance, the end of step (e) of the response/amendment filed 23 August, 2006, does not recite "includes said learned dynamic information of; and,"; **but instead, recites "includes said learned dynamic information; and,".**

Similarly, as will also be seen from the enclosed highlighted copy of applicant's response/amendment filed on 23 August, 2006, contrary to the Examiner's allegation in the Notice of Non-Compliance, the amended step (b) of the response/amendment filed 23 August, 2006, starting at line 6 of claim 1, does not recite "(b) a user information"; **but instead,** new amended step (b), which is fully underlined to show that it is added, **recites "(b) a user preferences knowledge base comprising preferences information personal to said user;".**

For the reasons stated in the response/amendment filed on 16 April, 2007, and the foregoing confirmation, and true copy of, applicant's response/amendment filed on

Page 2 of 3

23 August, 2006, applicant respectfully submits that the allegations of the Notice of Non-Compliance are incorrect and should be withdrawn. It appears that your Office's received copy of said amendment filed on 23 August, 2006 was in error; in particular, it appears that the copy received by your Office did not legibly print some of the strike-out lines in the listed claim 1.

Also for the reasons set out in the response/amendment filed on 16 April, 2007, applicant submits that the present claims, as amended on 16 April, 2007, are in good form for allowance and the same is requested.

Respectfully Submitted,
Abu-Hakima, Suhayya, Dr. et al.

By: _____
           Lynn S. Cassan
           Registration No. 32,378
           Attorney for applicant
           Phone: 613-238-6404 x.232

Date: 14 August, 2007